

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/090,326	GODFREY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenneth R. Horlick	1637	

All Participants:

(1) Kenneth R. Horlick.

(2) Jesse Hirshman.

Date of Interview: 7 February 2006

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
78-86

Prior art documents discussed:
Nakanishi et al.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.


☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant had brought a new prior art reference, Nakanishi et al., to the attention of the examiner, who now makes this reference of record. It was agreed that this new reference raises new issues as far as the patentability of claims 78-86, and thus these claims are canceled without prejudice.